Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE κότταβος κατακτός IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT INVESTIGATIONS.

By Herman W. Hayley.

THE nature of the so-called κότταβος κατακτός has been discussed pretty fully in two recent German dissertations[1]; but as the authors of these have come to opposite conclusions in regard to several points, it may be worth while to reconsider the evidence on both sides.

That the word κατακτός (from κατάγειν) in itself means "capable of being brought down" or "lowered" is undisputed, and may be assumed as certain. But why was the term applied to a variety of the κότταβος, and what was the nature of the variety thus designated?

It is evident from a comparison of Athenaeus 667 e, the schol. to Aristoph. Pax 1244 and the schol. to Lucian Lexiph. 3 (Vol. IV. p. 149 Jacobitz) that the author who is their common source distinguished two varieties of the cottabus, the κότταβος κατακτός and the παιδιὰ ἐν λεκάνῃ (or κότταβος δι' ὀξυβάφων). The κότταβος κατακτός he described as a tall, candelabrum-like instrument, equipped with a head (πρόσωπον) or figure called μάνης. If the throw was properly made, an object called the πλάστιγξ in its descent fell upon the μάνης. It is clear, therefore, that this writer (Dicaearchus? so Boehm, p. 14) included under the name of κότταβος κατακτός all instruments of the rod and plastinx type, or at least such of them as possessed the μάνης.[2] This being the case, it becomes highly probable that he understood the term κατακτός as referring to the *bringing down* (κατάγειν) of the πλάστιγξ from the top of the cottabus-rod — a

[1] "Das Kottabos-Spiel der alten Griechen," by Dr. Karl Sartori, Munich, 1893; "De Cottabo," by Chr. Boehm, Bonn, 1893.

[2] Unfortunately no ancient writer tells us whether the μάνης was *always* present in κοτταβεῖα of the rod and plastinx variety.

simple and natural explanation which has been recently revived by Sartori. If this explanation be correct, there can be little doubt that the ancients included under the name κότταβος κατακτός *all* instruments of the rod and plastinx type, as opposed to the κότταβος δι' ὀξυβάφων. Thus the two great varieties of the cottabus as seen in the vase-paintings receive their appropriate names.

There was, however, even in antiquity another explanation of the term κατακτός, which has found many adherents among modern scholars. In Athenaeus 666 e we read: ἐκάλουν δὲ καὶ κατακτούς τινας κοττάβους. ἔστι δὲ λυχνία ἀναγόμενα πάλιν τε συμπίπτοντα.[1] Εὔβουλος Βελλεροφόντῃ (II, 171 Kock).

> τίς ἂν λάβοιτο τοῦ σκέλους κάτωθε μοι;
> ἄνω γὰρ ὥσπερ κοττάβειον αἴρομαι.

These words clearly refer to some contrivance for raising and lowering the cottabus-rod, and have been so understood by most authorities. Sartori, to be sure, suggests that in using the words ἀνάγεσθαι and συμπίπτειν "Athenaeus wohl das Auflegen und Herabschleudern der Plastinx im Auge hat" (p. 90). But if this is so, it is difficult to see why Athenaeus chose a mode of expression so extremely liable to be misunderstood. We may conclude, therefore, that he, or the writer whom he followed in this passage, explained the term κατακτός as referring to a sliding rod, which could be lowered at will. The only question is whether he was right in so doing.

There are several reasons for believing that κοτταβεῖα with a movable rod were sometimes used by the ancients. The fragment already quoted from the Bellerophon of Eubulus is most easily understood on this hypothesis. Moreover, as Jahn long ago pointed out,[2] candelabra with an apparatus for regulating their height have been preserved. These have a solid shaft fitting into a hollow standard, both being pierced with small holes; so that by inserting a small peg through one of the holes in the standard and into a hole

---

[1] Cf. the schol. to Aristoph. Pax 1242: κατακτοὶ δὲ ἐκλήθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ κατάγειν καὶ αὖ πάλιν ἀνάγειν τὸν κότταβον.

[2] See "Philologus," vol. XXVI (1867), p. 206 ff.

in the shaft the instrument may be held at the required height.[1] Κοτταβεῖα in which the rod consists of two parts, the upper one being of less diameter than the lower and apparently fitting into it, occur repeatedly in the vase-paintings (see Boehm, p. 23) ; and it is probable that these had an arrangement similar to that of the candelabra just mentioned. Sartori (p. 88) lays great stress upon the fact that the vase-paintings show no trace of any peg inserted through an opening in the standard to hold the rod in place. But such a peg would be very small, and the artists who made the paintings would be extremely apt to omit it altogether. Sartori himself argues (p. 38) that the μάνης is not represented on the vases because of its small size ; yet the μάνης was surely far larger than such a peg would be. Moreover, it is not safe to assert that the peg is *never* shown in the paintings until all the vases on which the κότταβος κατακτός is figured have been carefully examined in regard to this point. Sartori also urges the fact that no contrivance for raising and lowering the rod is found in the extant κοτταβεῖα. But it is extremely doubtful whether the so-called cottabus-instruments that have been discovered are not really candelabra (cf. Boehm, p. 27 ff. ; Wochenschrift f. klass. Philologie, Sept. 20, 1893). Moreover none of them were found in Greece proper, and they are not numerous enough to justify the conclusion that instruments with a sliding rod were not in use. It is almost incredible that people so keen-witted as the Greeks should not have seen the advantages of the movable rod and have made the necessary improvement.

The probabilities, then, favor the hypothesis that cottabus-instruments with a sliding rod were sometimes used by the ancients ; but were these called κότταβοι κατακτοί?

There is a well-known passage in the Pax of Aristophanes (1240 ff.) which Higgins[2] and others have used as evidence that the κότταβος κατακτός had a movable rod. It runs thus :

ΟΠΛΩΝ ΚΑΠΗΛΟΣ

τί δ' ἆρα τῇ σάλπιγγι τῇδε χρήσομαι
ἢν ἐπριάμην δραχμῶν ποθ' ἑξήκοντ' ἐγώ ;

[1] See Quaranta, "Di un candelabro di bronzo," Naples, 1852, for a description of such a candelabrum. [2] See his article in "Archaeologia," vol. 51, pp. 363 ff.

ΤΡΥΓΑΙΟΣ

μόλυβδον ἐς τουτὶ τὸ κοῖλον ἐγχέας
ἔπειτ' ἄνωθεν ῥάβδον ἐνθεὶς ὑπόμακρον,
γενήσεταί σοι τῶν κατακτῶν κοττάβων.

The general sense is clear enough. Trygaeus advises the weapon-seller to convert the trumpet into the standard of a κότταβος κατακτός. This is to be accomplished by filling the bell-shaped κώδων of the σάλπιγξ with lead, so that it will stand firmly, and inserting into the mouth-piece a "longish rod." But there is not one word to indicate that the rod could be *raised* or *lowered* in the standard, unless we assume that the name κότταβος κατακτός implies this. We are not even justified in inferring that the cottabus-rod regularly consisted of two parts (cf. Boehm, p. 11). It is quite sufficient to suppose that the rod was added because the trumpet alone was not long enough for a ῥάβδος κοτταβική, though well adapted by its shape to form the base of the instrument (so Sartori, p. 25).

On the other hand, there are several reasons for believing that the name κότταβος κατακτός was not confined to κοτταβεῖα with a sliding rod. We find, both on the vases and in the literature, two great varieties of the cottabus, the rod and plastinx type and the κότταβος δι' ὀξυβάφων. This fact, as has been shown already, was recognized by the author whom Athenaeus, the scholiast to Aristophanes and the scholiast to Lucian followed in their descriptions of the cottabus. That author applied the term κατακτός to the rod and plastinx instrument, but, so far as we can judge, did not mention the *sliding* rod as essential. It is not at all probable that *all* instruments of the rod and plastinx type had a contrivance for varying their height; and if we confine the name κότταβος κατακτός to those possessing such a contrivance, we have no name whatever for those destitute of it. The sliding rod is but an unessential detail, and not a characteristic feature of the whole class. But if we accept the other explanation and include under the name of κότταβος κατακτός all κοτταβεῖα with rod and plastinx, we have an appropriate name for all instruments of this variety, as opposed to the κότταβος δι' ὀξυβάφων. Hence while Sartori is probably wrong in denying the existence of instru-

ments with a sliding rod, he is right in his main contention that the term κατακτός was applied to the rod and plastinx κοτταβεῖα as a class.

The nature of the rod and plastinx cottabus, or κότταβος κατακτός, as we shall call it henceforth, is tolerably clear from the description given by Athenaeus and from the vase-paintings; but there arises one very difficult question, about which scholars have entertained the most diverse opinions. What was the μάνης, which ancient writers[1] mention as a part of the κότταβος κατακτός?

Helbig, Robert, Sartori and most recent authorities identify it with the statuettes that surmount several of the so-called ῥάβδοι κοτταβικαί which have been found in Etruria. As Μάνης is a common slave-name, the fact that these statuettes represent slaves lends weight to the identification; but there are several arguments against it which seem quite conclusive. These arguments have been somewhat inadequately stated by Boehm, although they make for his own theory. They are as follows:

1. No such statuette is seen on the top of a cottabus-rod in any vase-painting. Robert and Sartori both admit this.

2. In a well-known fragment (II. 33 Kock) of the Ἀφροδίτης Γοναί of Antiphanes (who flourished about 380 B.C., while the κότταβος was still in use), one of the speakers says of the πλάστιγξ, which is resting on (ἐπικείμενον) the end of the ῥάβδος κοτταβική:

> ἐὰν θίγῃς μόνον
> αὐτῆς, ἐπὶ τὸν μάνην πεσεῖται καὶ ψόφος
> ἔσται πάνυ πολύς.

Nothing can be more explicit. The slightest touch will dislodge the πλάστιγξ, which will then fall upon the μάνης and produce a loud noise. But how can the πλάστιγξ fall from the top of the rod upon the μάνης, if the μάνης itself forms the top of the rod? Again, the author from whom Athenaeus, the scholiast to Aristophanes and the scholiast to Lucian took their descriptions of the κότταβος κατακτός (ll. s. c.) certainly had the words ἔχον ἐν αὐτῷ πρόσωπον, ὃ μάνην ἐκάλουν,

[1] See especially Athenaeus 667 e (cf. schol. on Aristoph. Pax 1244 and schol. on Lucian Lexiph. 3); a fragment of Antiphanes, II. 33 Kock; and the fragment of Hermippus, I. 237 Kock.

ἐφ' οὗ ἔδει πεσεῖν καταβαλλομένην τὴν πλάστιγγα (so the schol. to Aristophanes), or something of the same purport; for these words occur with very slight variations[1] in all three versions. It is clear, therefore, that the μάνης was at a considerable distance below the top of the rod, so that if the throw was skilfully made, the πλάστιγξ, in falling, would strike with sufficient force to produce a loud sound.

3. The alleged ῥάβδοι κοτταβικαί that have been discovered so closely resemble candelabra that the identification is rendered very uncertain (see Boehm, l. s. c.).

We may conclude, therefore, that the μάνης was not upon the top of the cottabus-rod.[2] There remain three alternatives. Either the μάνης was *between* the top of the rod and the basin (λεκάνη), or it was *within* the basin, or the basin itself was called μάνης.

The first of these alternatives might derive some support from the description of the κότταβος κατακτός in Athenaeus 667 e; but it is possible that the clause ἐντεῦθεν δὲ πίπτειν εἰς λεκάνην ὑποκειμένην πληγεῖσαν τῷ κοττάβῳ is an interpolation. It is not found in the schol. to Lucian Lexiph. 3 (Vol. IV. p. 149, Jacobitz) nor in the second schol. to Aristoph. Pax 1244, which were drawn from the same source as the account in Athenaeus; and the words πληγεῖσαν τῷ κοττάβῳ occasion difficulty.[3] Even if the clause is genuine, it is susceptible of a different interpretation, as will be shown later. Moreover, the vase-paintings show no object between the top of the cottabus-rod and the basin to which the name of μάνης could reasonably be given.

The theory that the basin or disk which encircled the shaft of the cottabus was called μάνης has recently been advocated with great

---

[1] Athenaeus has not the words ἐν αὐτῷ πρόσωπον, but says simply ἔχον τὸν μάνην καλούμενον.

[2] It may be suggested that the πλάστιγξ was hung or poised in some way *above* the end of the ῥάβδος κοταβική, so as to strike it or fall upon it if touched (cf. Pollux Onom. VI. 109). But the vase-paintings show the πλάστιγξ resting *directly upon* the top of the rod, not poised or suspended *above* it. Hence such a solution of the difficulty is excluded.

[3] Dobree proposed that they should be placed immediately after πλάστιγγα in the preceding clause, and Meineke so reads.

force and ingenuity by Boehm. Among his arguments the following deserve special notice :

1. The κόταβος κατακτός, as represented in the vase-paintings, regularly consists of three parts, the πλάστιγξ, the ῥάβδος κοταβική and the basin. Antiphanes (l. s. c.) and Hermippus (I. 237 Kock) likewise mention only three parts, the πλάστιγξ, the ῥάβδος and the μάνης. It is probable, therefore, that the basin and the μάνης were identical.

2. Athenaeus (487 e) informs us that the name μάνης was given to a kind of drinking-vessel ;[1] and Photius (s. v. μάνης) expressly states that the vessel used in the game of cottabus was called μάνης.

It must be admitted, also, that Boehm's theory accords very well with the evidence of the vase-paintings and with the description given by Antiphanes, who wrote before the cottabus went out of use. If Boehm is right, we may dismiss at one stroke all the absurd and confused statements of Pollux, the scholiasts to Aristophanes and Lucian, Tzetzes, etc. He cuts at one stroke the Gordian knot of the μάνης-problem.

But it must be confessed that Boehm's theory is open to some very serious objections.

1. In a fragment of the Salmoneus of Sophocles (494 Nauck) occur these lines :

> τῷ καλλικοτταβοῦντι νικητήρια
> τίθημι καὶ βαλόντι χάλκειον κάρα.

Athenaeus expressly states (487 d) that the words χάλκειον κάρα refer to the μάνης. They certainly could not well be applied to the λεκάνη.[2]

2. Again, the writer from whom the schol. to Pax 1244 and the schol. to Lucian Lexiph. 3 took their descriptions, spoke of the μάνης as a πρόσωπον ; for that term is applied to it in both versions. The

---

[1] Athenaeus continues : καλεῖται δὲ μάνης καὶ τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ κοττάβου ἐφεστηκός, ἐφ' οὗ τὰς λάταγας ἐν παιδιᾷ ἔπεμπον, on which Boehm (p. 27) observes : "quae verba quoniam in vasorum indice exstant, de vase vel de aliqua re vasi simili intellegenda sunt." But the remark may be a mere digression on the part of Athenaeus.

[2] Boehm (p. 15) thinks that χάλκειον κάρα means the πλάστιγξ, the "head" or "crown" of the instrument; but this interpretation seems forced.

πρόσωπον of these scholiasts is clearly the same thing as the χάλκειον κάρα of Sophocles, and seems to have been some kind of figure or statuette. A basin it certainly was not. We might also add that the schol. to Aristoph. 343 says that the μάνης was a statuette (ἀνδριάς); but his whole account of the cottabus with beam and scale-pans is so absurd as to have little or no weight. But the fact that Μάνης was a common slave-name certainly favors the view that the μάνης was a statuette.

3. The words of Athenaeus 667 e. ἔχον τὸν μάνην καλούμενον, ἐφ' ὃν τὴν καταβαλλομένην ἔδει πεσεῖν πλάστιγγα, ἐντεῦθεν δὲ πίπτειν εἰς λεκάνην ὑποκειμένην πληγεῖσαν τῷ κοττάβῳ are absolutely fatal to Boehm's hypothesis, if the last clause is genuine.

It is clear, therefore, that the theory of Boehm, although it is very attractive, should not be hastily accepted. There remains one alternative, that the μάνης was *within* the basin. It is strange that this solution of the difficulty, which certainly has much in its favor, has been entirely neglected by previous writers on the cottabus. If we suppose that the μάνης was a statuette of a slave standing in the λεκάνη, perhaps at a height of two or three inches above the bottom, the instrument will then accord very well with the description given by Antiphanes, and with those of Athenaeus and the two scholiasts so often referred to above. The requirements of the case are more fully met by this hypothesis than by any of the others that have been proposed. The fact that the statuette never appears in the vase-paintings is accounted for on the supposition that it was concealed within the basin, just as in representations of the κότταβος δι' ὀξυβάφων the ὀξύβαφα are not shown. As the πλάστιγξ would strike the μάνης before it did the basin, the remark of Athenaeus about the λεκάνη ὑποκειμένη would be amply justified. The old expression of the scholiasts, ἔχον ἐν αὑτῷ πρόσωπον, would also be accounted for, and the fragment from the Salmoneus would fall into line.

One serious objection may be urged against this theory. The κοτταβεῖα represented on the vases often have the basin *inverted* (cf. Boehm, p. 23; Sartori, p. 115). No doubt this is due in some cases to carelessness on the part of the artist; but there are some vase-paintings in which the basin was evidently *intentionally* represented with its concave side downwards. But we have no proof that the

statuette was *always* present. The game would be much less difficult without it, and it is improbable that it was always used. If now we suppose that when the statuette was not present, the name μάνης was transferred to the basin itself, the statement of Photius s. v. μάνης is easily explained.

A friend has suggested to the writer that if we suppose the μάνης to have been a statuette within the basin, the development of the κόταβος κατακτός may perhaps be traced somewhat as follows :

I. First step : the wine is thrown at the head of a living slave. Cf. Eurip. Oen. fr. 562 Nauck ; Aesch. Ostol. fr. 179 Nauck.

II. Second stage : A bronze figure called Μάνης is substituted for the slave.

III. Third stage : The figure is placed in a basin to prevent the floor from becoming sloppy with wine. Cf. Nonnus Dionys. XXXIII. 65 ff., where the players throw the wine at the head of a statuette of Hebe standing in a basin.

IV. Fourth stage : The wine is not thrown directly at the figure, but at a disk poised on a rod above it, so as to fall upon it. The μάνης remains in the basin, through the centre of which the rod passes. This is the fully developed κόταβος κατακτός.

Such are some of the theories that have been advanced in regard to this most perplexed and difficult problem. The present writer, while by no means certain that a final solution has yet been reached, is, on the whole, inclined to accept the theory last mentioned, as it seems to agree best with the evidence of the literature and to be liable to fewer grave objections than the rest. The question can only be settled by a new and careful examination of all the representations of the κόταβος κατακτός to be found in European museums. It is to be hoped that such an examination will soon be made by some competent scholar.

In conclusion, the writer may mention some simple experiments, with very rude apparatus, which he undertook in order to test the possibility of such a cottabus-game as he is inclined to suppose. They have satisfied him that, under the conditions assumed, to hit a statuette with the πλάστιγξ would be quite possible, and indeed not very difficult. A round box-cover of tin was used for a plastinx, and a little copper door-handle, resembling a head in shape, for a μάνης.

An ordinary tin basin of large size served for the λεκάνη. The rod was made of wood, and water was used instead of wine. At a distance of eight to twelve feet, the writer, by careful throwing, could hit the μάνης about once in five times. It projected two and a half inches above the bottom of the basin.